

**REMARKS****Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed November 30, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1 and 4-14 were pending in the application. Since no new claims have been added or cancelled, claims 1 and 4-14 remain pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Improper Final Rejection**

Applicant respectfully requests that the finality of the office action be removed since it is based on a new reference applied for the first time in the office action dated November 30, 2005. The office action erroneously states that the applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection since the features included in the pending independent claims were present in the originally filed claims 2 and 3 (which were then cancelled after their features were included in the independent claims). That is, the new reference was cited to attempt to cure a *prima facie* deficiency in the prior office action and was not necessitated by the amendments of the applicant.

**Prior Art Rejections**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 13, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,408,303 to Richards (hereafter "Richards"), U.S. patent 5,862,325 to Reed et al. (hereafter "Reed") and U.S. patent application publication 2001/0043234 to Kotamarti (hereafter "Kotamarti"). Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed and Kotamarti, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,662,197 to LeCrone et al. (hereafter "LeCrone"). Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed, and Kotamarti as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,418,400 to Webber (hereafter "Webber"). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed, Kotamarti, LeCrone, and Webber. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards and Reed, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Webber and U.S. patent 5,202,977 to Pasetes, Jr. et

al. (hereafter "Pasetes"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the pending independent claims 1, 11, and 14 recite a method (or program product) for processing an inbound document received from a trading partner in a business-to-business electronic data processing system in which, *inter alia*, (1) an auto-creation flag is stored for each of a plurality of interworking standards, and (2) a trading partner profile is automatically created from a template only if the system determines that an auto-creation flag is set for the particular interworking standard determined to be associated with the received inbound document. Neither of the above two features are disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art.

Specifically, the office action acknowledges that neither Richards nor Reid disclose or suggest these features. The office action then alleges that Kotamarti discloses this feature and cites to figures 3, 5, 7, 8, and paragraphs 80-92 for this proposition. However, this disclosure of Kotamarti has nothing to do with the claimed features of (1) an auto-creation flag is stored for each of a plurality of interworking standards, and (2) a trading partner profile is automatically created from a template only if the system determines that an auto-creation flag is set for the particular interworking standard determined to be associated with the received inbound document. The cited portions of Kotamarti only relates to *executing* particular preset functions (i.e., a macro or a set of instructions as discussed in paragraph 29) when rendering a web based GUI in an audio modality. The office action cites to paragraph 91 as being particularly relevant but this paragraph merely discloses loop processing of the set of instructions contained in a preset (or macro) and has simply nothing to do with the claimed *creation of a trading party profile* from a template only if an auto-creation flag is stored for a particular interworking standard that is determined to be associated with the received inbound document.

Therefore, since none of these references disclose these claimed features, their reasonable combination (even if proper which we do not believe to be case) necessarily does not teach or suggest these claimed features. These deficiencies in Richards, Reed, or Kotamarti are also not cured by any of the other applied references. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by section 103.

The recited features provides the advantage that it allows the user to create templates that include default information for the particular interworking standards for which the auto-

creation flag has been set. In fact, the type of templates may also be set for different standard levels as disclosed, for example, on page 6, lines 12-24 of the specification. Therefore, the applied prior art does not disclose either the specifically recited features or its advantages.

The dependent claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons, as discussed above, as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is courteously invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 28, 2006


FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By



William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants